

who run the shelter, as well as stakeholders in Laredo, elected officials, and other NGO representatives. We heard from them about the mounting challenges of this crisis.

I visited three additional facilities in Midland, Dallas, and Houston during this last work period, and I saw the incredible ways that these communities and the nongovernmental associations are caring for migrant children.

Let me just say, we all recognize our obligation to treat these children and these migrants humanely while they are here in our country, but we also need to make sure that our laws are equally enforced on a fair basis and that people who come this way don't jump ahead of people who have been waiting patiently in line to come into the United States through legal means.

Just before the State work period started, Senator CRUZ and I hosted 17 of our fellow Republican colleagues in the Senate down at the Rio Grande Valley. I was pleased when I heard from my friend HENRY CUELLAR that he had hosted JOE MANCHIN, the Senator from West Virginia, and JOHN HICKENLOOPER, the Senator from Colorado. I am glad that Members of both parties are coming down to learn for themselves and to listen to the experts I depend on to give me good information.

We saw the facility in Donna and learned about the challenges created by such a high volume of unaccompanied children. For folks who don't live in a border State or haven't spent much time in our border communities, it is important to see the situation firsthand and to learn from those experts whom I mentioned a moment ago.

I have worked with folks in the Rio Grande Valley throughout my time in the Senate to ensure that these communities are safe, prosperous, and vibrant places to live. These men and women have valuable insight for all of us into the policies that have led to this crisis and the ones we need to put in place to turn things around. I appreciate these experts who spent time sharing their feedback with all of us who have been interested enough to travel to the border and the colleagues who visited there. I am glad our colleagues were able to see and learn more about the unique challenges facing these communities and our Nation when it comes to uncontrolled, overwhelming masses of humanity.

To read news stories about the thousands of children who are brought to the United States alone is heart-breaking. To see their faces, though, and learn more about the devastating circumstances in which they were brought here is also nothing short of heartbreaking.

At the Kay Bailey Hutchison Convention Center in Dallas, which is now serving as a shelter for 2,300 young boys, I heard from one young boy who arrived in the United States after a 3-month trek from Central America on foot. He told us that he spent time hid-

ing in jungles along the way and that food was scarce through much of their journey. As you could imagine, he was happy to be at a safe shelter receiving three square meals a day. He was understandably soft-spoken about his long and treacherous journey, and I am sure he experienced hardships that you and I could hardly imagine—certainly circumstances we would never want our children or grandchildren to experience.

Last week, some truly disturbing allegations came out about abuse in one of the temporary facilities in San Antonio. As I said, these children have arrived in our country after a perilous journey. Many arrive sick, malnourished, and having endured abuse, including assault, along the way. The fact that any of these forms of abuse could continue while under the care of the U.S. Government is despicable. I have called on the inspector general of Health and Human Services to fully investigate these allegations of sexual assault in this facility at the Freeman Coliseum. I hope the administration will support our efforts to get to the bottom of what happened and ensure that no child is ever subjected to any level of mistreatment while in our care.

The real kicker in all of this is that as all of this is unfolding, the coyotes, the smugglers, and the cartels that bring these children to our border are getting richer and richer and richer. Border Patrol said it is common for families to pay thousands of dollars to the coyotes to bring children to America. With nearly 19,000 caught last month alone, it is easy to see how profitable this business is.

Let's say the cartels charge \$5,000 a head—a low estimate based on some of the figures I have seen. That would mean these criminals brought in nearly \$100 million in revenue in March alone just from smuggling children. These cartels—these transnational criminal organizations—tactics include dropping children as young as 3 years old over the top of a 14-foot segment of the border wall or allowing a 6-month-old child to be thrown from a raft into the Rio Grande River to divert Border Patrol while they attempt a rescue so they can get on their way.

This has to stop. We can get into an argument about who is to blame, but that doesn't change the more important matter about who has the power to stop it.

First, President Biden needs to acknowledge the scope of this crisis and commit to addressing it along with us in the Congress. All we have gotten from the White House so far are statements telling migrants now is not the time to come, as if they would let everyone know when the time to come is appropriate.

Two weeks ago, President Biden tasked Vice President Harris to lead efforts to address this crisis, and I thought this was a sign that the administration was finally ready to take

some informed action. But the Vice President has not made a single trip to the border yet, and there is not even one on the horizon. Then she seemed to walk back—that, no, her assignment wasn't at the border; it was to engage in diplomacy with countries in Central America.

Simple statements urging people not to come are meaningless when all of the policies represent a flashing green light. That is especially true when Central Americans hear messages from their family and friends who have made it to America that the door is wide open and they will be let in.

The administration must take action and implement policies that discourage parents from sending their children on this perilous and dangerous journey in the hands of human smugglers and criminals into the United States.

We have a big role to play too. Immigration reform has been one of my greatest frustrations throughout my time here. Previous attempts to make lasting changes led to bills that were so big that they crumbled under their own weight. I hope we can all agree that this is not the time to repeat that history. We need to take action to address the crisis at hand now, without extraneous matters that could be and should be changes made down the line. I am working with some of my Democratic colleagues to achieve this end, and I am eager to share more details soon.

Republicans and Democrats must work together to address this crisis and to bring order out of chaos and to protect the innocent children who are being harmed.

Legal immigration has been one of the cornerstones of our great country throughout our history. Legal immigration is generous, it is safe, it is orderly, and it is fair. Illegal immigration and the horrors that it brings along with it, some of which we learned about on our recent trips to the border, are not humane. They dishonor the willingness of the people who want to come to the country legally, who wait patiently in line, by jumping ahead of them in line. But, as I said, the cartels and human smugglers know our laws and our vulnerabilities better than we do, and they are exploiting it each and every day. We have to bring it to an end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I am here on the floor of the Senate this evening to talk about our shared national priorities for addressing the Nation's infrastructure needs and my concerns—really deep concerns—about the plan the Biden administration has outlined and specifically the way they intend to pay for it.

I don't think there is a single Member in this Chamber who does not recognize the need for us to invest in upgrading America's aging infrastructure. Our network of roads, bridges,

ports, railroads, and more has played an integral role over the decades in growing our world-class economy. Yet, according to a 2019 report, the most recent one we have from the World Economic Forum, the United States now ranks only 13th in the world in infrastructure based on factors like the quality of our roads, how efficient our trains are, and access to electricity and water.

So we can and should do more to improve our infrastructure, particularly as competitors like China make substantial investments in their own infrastructure every year. We can do so in a bipartisan way, just as we have always done. In fact, last Congress, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee approved bipartisan infrastructure legislation by a unanimous vote of 21 to 0. That was just last Congress, 21 to 0. This bipartisan approach last Congress totaled \$287 billion—a substantial amount and one we have yet to figure out how to pay for.

The current Transportation bill that is in play, the so-called infrastructure bill from a few years ago, is about \$310 billion. Yet, even as we have to figure out how to fund the bipartisan \$287 billion package for roads and bridges from last year—a substantial amount in its own right—the Biden administration recently introduced its own infrastructure plan that totals \$2.7 trillion, almost 10 times as much.

At the core of this Biden administration proposal is \$620 billion in infrastructure broadly defined. It has a generous definition of the roads, bridges, and other physical transportation and water components that have traditionally been considered infrastructure. So a generous definition would be that out of the \$2.7 trillion, \$620 billion could be called infrastructure based on the way Republicans and Democrats alike have always looked at it, and again, that would include water, electricity, and other forms of transportation, not just roads and bridges. So about 20 percent of the Biden administration infrastructure bill actually fits the bill.

The reason the overall package costs \$2.7 trillion is because they have included a broad set of liberal priorities that are a far cry from what has ever been defined as infrastructure by either Democrats or Republicans. So, I guess, knowing the popularity of infrastructure—and it is popular; people want to see their roads and bridges repaired—the Biden administration has simply redefined the word to include hundreds of billions of dollars of spending on priorities like healthcare, Federal office buildings and other facilities, research and development, electric vehicle manufacturing, and more.

According to the Biden administration, paid leave is now infrastructure, childcare is now infrastructure, and caregiving is now infrastructure. While many are worthy causes and should be debated and voted on separately, they don't belong in infrastructure bills.

This approach is troubling to me and, I know, to many of my colleagues on

both sides of the aisle because it is a continuation of the raw partisanship that defined the latest COVID-19 spending package back in March. Rather than work to find good-faith negotiations with Republicans to craft a package that can gain bipartisan support, the Biden administration and Senate Democrats apparently are once again looking into potentially using reconciliation to jam Republicans—to pass another trillion-dollar-plus spending bill with a simple 50-vote majority. And, like COVID-19, infrastructure has always been bipartisan. So if you can't be bipartisan on COVID-19 and you can't be bipartisan on infrastructure, what can you be bipartisan about?

This partisan approach, by the way, is the opposite of what President Biden pledged on the campaign trail and in his inauguration address. In his inaugural address, he talked about the need to get back to more bipartisanship and urged unity. I agreed with that assessment and said so at the time.

Unfortunately, he has apparently listened to the more strident voices in his party and has gone down the partisan path. As with the \$1.9 trillion COVID spending package last March, the end result could be another spending bill that is far higher than it needs to be at a time of record debt and deficits and another partisan bill that further divides us at a time when we are already too divided. In fact, about a quarter of the Biden plan is not paid for at all, taking us further into debt.

But even more troubling to me is that the Democrats plan to pay for roughly \$2 trillion of this plan with massive tax increases on American workers and consumers and by making us less competitive in the global economy. This would completely reverse the progress we have made over the past few years in making America competitive again. Thanks to the 2017 tax reforms that the Biden proposal would largely dismantle, in the couple of years before COVID-19, we saw record growth in jobs and wages, with the lowest poverty rate since the Federal Government started keeping track of it 60 years ago.

In promoting the Biden tax increases, Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen claims we need to reverse the 2017 tax reforms because they encourage businesses to move jobs out of the country. The reality is just the opposite. The 2017 tax reforms stopped the so-called corporate tax inversions, which caused American companies to become foreign companies and move jobs and investment out of America because of our uncompetitive tax laws. This happened to a number of companies in Ohio and in every State, practically, represented in this Chamber.

The 2017 reforms also stopped the lockout effect that kept foreign profits of U.S. companies overseas. They weren't bringing the profits back. Instead, \$1.6 trillion in overseas earnings has come back to the United States and was invested right here at home.

Most importantly for working families, 70 percent of the savings from the corporate tax cuts went into workers' wages, contributing to 19 straight months of wage growth of over 3 percent annually that we enjoyed before the pandemic. This wage growth was really welcome in my home State Ohio. We had lower wages, or flat wages, for more than a decade.

And, by the way, who benefited most from this wage increase—19 straight months of wage increases? Lower and middle-income workers—exactly what should have been happening.

Thanks to the 2017 reforms, the largest U.S. companies also increased their domestic research and development expenditures by 25 percent, which amounts to \$707 billion more R&D. And they further increased capital expenditures by 20 percent, aided by this return of foreign profits.

All of this U.S. investment, job creation, and new R&D would be put at risk by these proposed tax hikes. Under the Biden plan, which we have heard is raising the corporate rate from 21 to 28 percent, in actuality, the combined Federal and State corporate rate would go from 25.8 percent, where it is now when you include the State and Federal—other countries like China don't have any State income tax on their corporations. They just have the Federal rate. So we would be going from 25.8 percent—by the way, which is already above the average of 23.4 percent for other developed countries, so-called OECD countries—it would go from 25.8 percent up to a staggering 32.8 percent, the highest rate in the developed world.

Our tax rate would once again be higher than China's and higher than any country in the developed world—Japan, Europeans. This is exactly what we got away from in 2017, and it was on a bipartisan basis. There was a consensus for us to do that—maybe not the exact rate, but the idea was to make America competitive again.

I cochaired a task force with a fellow Senator, a Democrat from the across the aisle, CHUCK SCHUMER, on the Finance Committee, and we came up with this idea of saying: Let's go to a territorial-type tax system, and let's lower the rate so that we can be competitive around the world. That is what happened, and it is working.

Now, for some reason, the Biden administration says: We want to reverse all that. These abrupt tax hikes, which actually would be five times as large as the corresponding corporate tax cuts in 2017, would make our workers and our businesses less competitive globally at a time when our economy is just starting to recover.

The Biden plan goes well beyond just making our tax rates uncompetitive again. It also doubles the tax on so-called global intangible low-taxed income, or GILTI, making it more costly for U.S. companies to operate outside the United States, more costly than any other country's companies of any

developed country in the world. Again, it puts us at a competitive disadvantage. It unfairly punishes American workers who have their jobs here in America, supporting international operations.

In Ohio, for example, we have Procter & Gamble. It is headquartered in my hometown. They rely on overseas production to serve foreign markets in an affordable manner. They are not going to ship diapers from here overseas because it is not cost-competitive. So, for the foreign markets, they will make diapers in those foreign countries. However, by doing so, they employ thousands of Ohioans and others around this country who support those international sales. So all the back-office work, the sales work, the research and development, and so on is done here. The proposed Biden tax increases would make such companies uncompetitive overseas, resulting in our losing markets there and losing U.S. jobs. Remember, no other developed country in the world does this except us. No other country taxes these companies on their foreign profits. We got away from that on purpose, and we essentially established a minimum tax, which, again, hardly any country in the world has, but we wanted to have some balance here.

Now, under this proposal from the Biden administration, that tax would be more than double. It is going to hurt us. The Biden administration also proposes to eliminate a provision regarding what is called foreign-derived intangible income, FDII. In 2017, we put FDII in place for a very simple reason, and there seemed to be a consensus about that, which is to provide a carrot to U.S. companies to do their research and development here in America. It incentivized companies to bring that research back and to keep that research here. It worked to create high-skilled and high-wage jobs.

For example, Google, Cisco, and Facebook brought all of their intellectual property home—brought all of their IP home. And we heard from other U.S. companies like Intel and Disney, which said they kept their IP in the United States due to this tax law change. Why would we want that to go overseas?

The Biden administration claims that it wants the United States to be more competitive, yet these proposed tax increases do just the opposite. It makes no sense that while China and other countries are increasing subsidies to businesses that innovate, the United States would be punishing our workers and global companies, making them less competitive.

In what amounts to an astounding admission of how deeply flawed these proposals are, when Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen announced the proposal to increase taxes we just talked about, she actually went out of her way to make a plea to other countries around the world. She asked them to raise their own corporate tax rates and

to increase their own taxes to ensure, as she said, a more level playing field.

Understanding the nature of the intense global competition, our competitors are doing just the opposite. It is naive to think that because we are going to raise our taxes and ask them to do the same that they would do that. They want more of the jobs and investment in their country.

In fact, just this past week, the Finance Minister of Ireland, when asked about this, said they have no interest in raising taxes. Ireland is one of those countries that has made themselves competitive and resulted in our tax law changes because they were taking jobs away from us, and now we were bringing this IP and these jobs back. Ireland, China, and these other countries are going to continue to lower barriers to attract capital and jobs. It is wishful thinking, at best, to think that because we are going to raise our taxes, they are going to raise theirs.

The Biden plan would mean America standing alone atop the corporate tax rate chart among all developed countries—standing alone, leaving our businesses and workers to suffer the cost, a fact borne out from multiple studies, including from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office that shows it is workers who bear most of the burden of higher taxes in the form of lower wages and lost jobs. It is not the corporations; it is the workers.

As I said before, there is a clear need for us to reinvest in American infrastructure. I think we can all agree with that. Republicans and Democrats alike want to do it, and, right now, in the key committee of jurisdiction, by the way, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, bipartisan negotiations are ongoing. This is the same committee that had a unanimous vote last Congress on the transportation legislation.

They are talking right now about how to put together a bipartisan package. That is the right way to do it: Go through regular order and allow Democrats and Republicans alike to offer their ideas.

There is also a group of Republicans and Democrats outside of the committee who have met and are looking for a more sensible way forward. I am among that group. There are others as well.

The partisan approach by the Biden administration looks to be taking us down the road of another trillion-dollar-plus spending package jammed through Congress with no support from the other side of the aisle. That is not good for this institution. It is not good for this country. It is not the way to get things done.

Instead of a \$2.7 trillion plan that goes beyond any reasonable definition of infrastructure and is mostly paid for with a devastating tax hike on U.S. workers and our economy, let's do what we know works: a bipartisan approach focused on what we have all agreed is infrastructure—roads,

bridges, ports, rail, broadband, and other true infrastructure.

I believe if we take that more targeted approach, we can build on the bipartisan framework this Congress has achieved in recent years and work together to find commonsense ways to fund infrastructure legislation, including user fees, which is what we have always used in the past, without resorting to partisan tax hikes, which reduce the competitiveness of U.S. workers, U.S. companies, and undermine investment in our country. I hope we take that better approach.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, we have just listened to Senator PORTMAN, and you are hearing others of us on the Republican side of the aisle talk about the elevated levels of spending and how our Democratic colleagues have seemed to lose touch with the American people. This is something that appears to have happened at lightning speed.

It really began on the very first day of the Biden administration. It started with the stroke of a pen and a stream of Executive orders. On Day 1, President Biden made a decision that he would weaken our border, and with that stroke of a pen, he destroyed hundreds—hundreds, thousands—of good-paying union jobs right in the middle of a pandemic, and that was by eliminating the Keystone Pipeline. With every decision, he has made it abundantly clear that he came back to Washington not to serve this country but to advance an agenda pushed by the most radical leftwing of the Democratic Party.

That being said, the White House has a problem because the American people have figured out what they are up to, and as I have been home for the past couple of weeks, I have talked to Tennesseans from every political division. They are Democrats, Republicans, Independents; they are unaffiliated; and they are concerned citizens. It bothers them, what they are seeing from this White House. How could they not have, after seeing Senate Democrats spend \$1.9 trillion on coronavirus relief that spent just 9 percent of that pricetag on testing and healthcare jobs? If that didn't do it, President Biden surely ticked them off when he nominated a Health and Human Services Secretary with no healthcare experience—zero—and a Homeland Security Secretary who believes that we should have unsecured borders. You cannot make this up. People are astounded with this.

So when people back home in Tennessee saw President Biden's latest proposal for a \$2 trillion so-called infrastructure bill, they weren't particularly shocked to see that very little of this legislation has to do with infrastructure.

Just 3 months into the new administration and already they know that

this is just another vehicle for the left's wish list.

The most frustrating thing about it is that Tennesseans have repeatedly told me that a smart, targeted plan to fund infrastructure improvements would make a tremendous difference in local communities and in our State. They support that type of investment. They want to see that. Roads, bridges, waterways, highways, broadband, airports, they are for that. What they don't support is an administration that repeatedly promises one thing and then chooses to do the opposite.

Just like last month's over-the-top spending bill, this month's multitrillion-dollar boondoggle isn't just a waste of taxpayer dollars; it is a missed opportunity to rebuild parts of our economy that were struggling to keep up before the pandemic hit.

Here is a number for your talking points: Less than 6 percent. And what is less than 6 percent? That is the amount, that is the percentage of this \$2 trillion bill that actually goes to infrastructure projects—less than 6 percent.

Tennesseans are asking me: How could this possibly happen? We have been talking about having an infrastructure bill now for about 3 years, and you bring a bill forward—the Democratic leadership does—and less than 6 percent goes to infrastructure.

Now, this sounds like a familiar tactic: Redefine your standards, put less than 10 percent of your funding toward your stated purpose, then throw the rest into yet another handout for projects that would not stand a chance. They wouldn't have a snowball's chance of receiving public support on their own, much less 60 votes here in this Chamber.

President Biden's American jobs plan ignores rural Tennesseans who have to navigate flood plains to get to work or to get to school. It bypasses crumbling bridges they can't avoid, but it sure does pay a lot of attention to Green New Deal policies that were non-starters even before Speaker PELOSI lost ground in the House.

Climate change studies and union payouts take precedent over roads, bridges, ports, airports, and waterways. In fact, this absurd scheme spends more taxpayer money on electric cars than on all of those things combined. Yes, you heard me correctly. This so-called infrastructure bill spends more money, more of your hard-earned tax dollars, on electric cars than on all of the roads, bridges, highways, ports, airports, and waterways. That is correct.

Another day, another power grab made worse by job-destroying, corporate tax increases that will put American companies at a global disadvantage. It is no wonder Democrats have been working overtime to stretch the definition of "infrastructure" past the point of reason.

These days, entire White House press briefings rely on the idea that the definition of "infrastructure" will con-

tinue to evolve—as they say, it is going to evolve—to make it include whatever the Democrats decide that it should include. It is a time-honored liberal trick that has run its course.

They can tweet that lie every day for the next 4 years if they choose, but here in the real world, we are dealing with an economy still in recovery, major industries in crisis, and millions of families who are working terribly hard and long hours to just make ends meet.

What we are seeing here isn't just a disconnect. This is an administration attempting to impose their socialist vision on a country that cannot sustain the cost.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I want to be clear. That vision of America that you have invented to fulfill this purpose does not exist. It is time to come up for air and talk a little reality.

I know it is a popular thing here in Washington to claim that elections have consequences, but on your first day back in power, the Democratic Party got together and marched right across the line that separates consequences from punishment. Punishment, that is what they are all about.

I would also encourage my Democratic colleagues to remember that when they do this, when they put together these trillion-dollar handouts for radical special interests, political pain for their opponents isn't the only result. They are punishing their neighbors, their friends, communities that are in their States. They are making life harder, much more difficult, for local businesses and small business manufacturers, and they are exposing our weaknesses to our adversaries.

I will tell you, if President Biden and the majority leader shove yet another blank check through this Chamber, they are going to find out in a hurry. I really do believe, how little the American people have to give for their leftist agenda.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 55, Polly Ellen Trottenberg, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

Charles E. Schumer, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A.

Coons, Patty Murray, Jeff Merkley, Tammy Baldwin, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Richard Blumenthal, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Chris Van Hollen, Ron Wyden, Angus S. King, Jr., Robert P. Casey, Jr., Amy Klobuchar, Christopher Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Polly Ellen Trottenberg, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 81, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 143 Ex.]

YEAS—81

Baldwin	Graham	Peters
Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Risch
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Romney
Booker	Hirono	Rosen
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Cantwell	Johnson	Schatz
Capito	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	Kelly	Shaheen
Carper	King	Sinema
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Cassidy	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lujan	Tester
Cornyn	Lummis	Thune
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Toomey
Cramer	Markey	Van Hollen
Crapo	Marshall	Warner
Duckworth	McConnell	Warnock
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Ernst	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wicker
Fischer	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young

NAYS—14

Blackburn	Hagerty	Scott (FL)
Braun	Hawley	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Cruz	Lee	Tuberville
Daines	Paul	

NOT VOTING—5

Moran	Murray	Tillis
Murkowski	Rubio	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). On this vote, the yeas are 81, the nays are 14.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Ohio.

AMAZON UNION DRIVE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, on Friday, Amazon, one of the world's largest corporations, successfully crushed the most recent union drive at one of their warehouses, where workers were organizing for a voice on the job.